9/19/73

Dear Jim,

After you left I started reading the various clippings. I've gone through all those on the Garrison case, albeit in haste and skipping what didn t relate to him. I find myself agreeing with Garrison for a rare change, without knowing the reason for his split with the lawyers. I find that if the news accounts fairly represent the in-court developments, their defense and cross-examinations were not at all vigorous and did not go into what is obvious. There is none of this I can assign to the typical lawyers' failure to investigate or to be able to, not with a Bailey participation. On the other hand, my initial belief is that the split came over Jim's insistence on taking the stand in his own defense.

My original analysis of the long addisavits is substantiated bu this reading. What I find surprising is that after making all the deals it did, the governments se ms to have added nothing to that evidence. I then felt the only charge that could really be clevelled against Jim is not prosecuting Soule and Frey, but my notes of that period will also show the belief than an order to look into would wipe that out. That is actuably in the government's evidence.

There is nothing I have seen to this minute that shows anything other than what I believed all along, that Jimwas taking money for lobbying. His influence on the governor I knew. What impresses me is that he did not say what he usually did about McKeithen.

I am also impressed by an obvious defense failure not to go into the stationing of the monitoring car aut of range of the average FM bug when after dark there was no need. I kjow that area and there is parking space nearby and not visible from Jim's home. I'm also surprised that they let the agents get away with saying that a machine malfunctioned for 15 minutes and then suddenly got better by itself so they just didn't use the first 15 minutes.

I am impressed by the government giving exactly the account Jim gave me of the breaking into his desk. There was no need to destroy it. There likewise was no reason for the judge to do the prosecution's job here and ask about how the desk could be locked without a key. I had a government desk that did. But this bears of what I told you long ago, that Christenberry hates Garrison. I think that with the coyrts of the east, the record alone would support prejudice.

What is missing in what I read is what can reasonably be called an over act in pursuit of the conspiracy by Jim. I was there when he prosecuted these same defendants and Marcello. Taking the money, for whatever reason, is not an act in pursuit of a conspiracy, is it? If not, then what act to forward the thing did he take, from the evidence?

I think it is conspicuous that the government didn't produce Alford, unless the y are holding him for rebuttal. He can be clobbered but won't be. If produced.

No time for more. I believe the government is in serious trouble on this one. Nothing else explains making deals with most of the other defendants, from whom nothing worth the compromise has come. The did to Jim what he did to Shaw, charged with no more than they released on charging.

Maybe it is just vengeance, but with this case, they had to know they have little chance of winning, none without corruption. So, why the prosecution? Just adding him to the case they had?

In haste,